

In re Patent Application of:
CHAPMAN ET AL.
Serial No. 09/596,629
Filing Date: June 19, 2000

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the thorough examination of the present application. The arguments supporting patentability of the claims are presented in detail below.

I. The Claims Are Patentable

The Examiner rejected independent Claims 1, 12, 22, 31, 42, 52 and 61 over the Hager et al. patent in view of the Kuzma patent. The present invention, as recited in independent Claim 1, for example, is directed to a method for distributing an invention disclosure over an intranet. The method comprises the steps of creating and submitting an invention disclosure over the intranet, with the invention disclosure being submitted by an inventor to at least one evaluator via e-mail with a hyperlink to the invention disclosure, and transmitting evaluation comments of the invention disclosure by the at least one evaluator via e-mail. Creating the invention disclosure comprises including an attachment therewith, with the attachment having been created separate from the invention disclosure.

The method in accordance with the present invention advantageously allows the inventor and evaluators to exchange e-mail messages within the intranet for providing notification and status of the invention disclosure. Moreover, creating the attachment separate from the invention disclosure allows the inventor to incorporate previously generated work related to their invention, which provides for a user friendly and efficient method of creating and distributing an invention disclosure within an organization or company.

In re Patent Application of:
CHAPMAN ET AL.
Serial No. 09/596,629
Filing Date: June 19, 2000

Referring now to the Hager et al. patent, an automation of procedures in a local area network (LAN) environment is disclosed. The procedures are automated in a data processing system with regard to the invention disclosures stored therein. As correctly noted by the Examiner, Hager et al. fails to disclose an attachment for the invention disclosure being created separate from the invention disclosure and then being attached thereto.

The Examiner cited the Kuzma patent as disclosing attachments being added to e-mail messages. The Examiner has taken the position that it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify Hager et al. in view of Kuzma with respect to creating an attachment separately from a document.

The Applicants respectfully submit that even if the references were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the claimed invention is still not produced. Reference is directed to column 4, line 65 to column 5, line 6 of Kuzma, which provides:

"Referring now to FIG. 4, there is illustrated an e-mail message format 400 in accordance with a preferred embodiment of the present invention. In the e-mail message format 400 of the present invention, when a user such as PC 210 of FIG. 2 wishes to send an attachment with an e-mail message to a user such as PC 212, the e-mail message 401 is transmitted along a relatively small attachment reference 402, instead of actually transmitting the entire attachment file along with e-mail message 401 ..."
(Emphasis added.)

More particularly, Kuzma discloses that the sender

In re Patent Application of:
CHAPMAN ET AL.
Serial No. 09/596,629
Filing Date: June 19, 2000

requests an e-mail option from the recipient, which provides a configurable e-mail page to the sender in response to the request. An attachment reference comprising the network address of the attachment is supplied to the configurable e-mail page, which is then sent back to the recipient.

In the claimed invention, the invention disclosure is submitted over the intranet to an evaluator via e-mail with a hyperlink to the invention disclosure. When the invention disclosure is created, it includes a separately created attachment, and this attachment becomes part of the invention disclosure itself. Consequently, the e-mail sent to the evaluator includes a hyperlink to the invention disclosure. The attachment in the claimed invention is thus part of the invention disclosure document, whereas in Kuzma, the attachment is included directly with the e-mail (or document) via an attachment reference.

Even assuming that the attachment was added directly to the invention disclosure in Hager et al., the attachment is still treated as an attachment reference. That is, the invention disclosure in Hager et al. would not include the entire attachment file as in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, it is submitted that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Hager et al. in view of Kuzma. Independent Claims 12, 22, 31, 42, 52 and 61 are similar to independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that these claims are also patentable over Hager et al. in view of Kuzma. In view of the patentability of the independent Claims 1, 12, 22, 31, 42, 52 and 61, it is submitted that their dependent claims, which recite yet further distinguishing features of

In re Patent Application of:

CHAPMAN ET AL.

Serial No. 09/596,629

Filing Date: June 19, 2000


the invention, are also patentable. These dependent claims require no further discussion herein.

In re Patent Application of:
CHAPMAN ET AL.
Serial No. 09/596,629
Filing Date: June 19, 2000
/

CONCLUSION

In view of the arguments provided herein, it is submitted that all the claims are patentable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is requested in due course. Should any minor informalities need to be addressed, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


MICHAEL W. TAYLOR
Reg. No. 43,182
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath
& Gilchrist, P.A.
255 S. Orange Avenue, Suite 1401
Post Office Box 3791
Orlando, Florida 32802
407-841-2330

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing correspondence has been forwarded via facsimile number 703-872-9306 to the Commissioner for Patents on this 14 day of September, 2004.

